

**CITY OF MORGAN HILL  
JOINT SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL, SPECIAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
AND SPECIAL ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MEETING  
MINUTES – SEPTEMBER 8, 2004**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mayor Kennedy called the special meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

**ROLL CALL ATTENDANCE**

City Council:

Present: Council Members Carr, Chang, Tate and Mayor Kennedy  
Late: Mayor Pro Tempore Sellers (arrived at 7:20 p.m.)

Architectural Review Board:

Present: Board Members: Cain, Kennett and Martin  
Absent: Board Members: Fruit and Pyle

Planning Commission:

Present: Commissioners: Acevedo, Escobar, Lyle, Mueller, Weston  
Absent: Commissioners: Benich, Engles

**DECLARATION OF POSTING OF AGENDA**

City Clerk Torrez certified that the meeting's agenda was duly noticed and posted in accordance with Government Code 54954.2.

**SILENT INVOCATION**

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT**

Mayor Kennedy opened the floor to public comment for items not appearing on this evening's agenda. No comments were offered.

**WORKSHOP:**

**1. ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW HANDBOOK.**

Senior Planner Linder presented the staff report requesting that the Council, Board and Commission provide comments on the draft standards as listed in the draft Architectural Review Handbook (handbook) and whether they reflect the standards the City would like to see in the community. Also, to identify standards that were not addressed/touched upon.

Mayor Kennedy felt that the City needs to determine how the handbook will be applied and how the applicants are to apply the standards. He noted that the handbook did not contain a preamble or statement of vision, goals, circumstances, and did not address how to use the document. He noticed that a combination of “shalls” and “shoulds” were being used.

Senior Planner Linder indicated that staff and the consultant will go over how the document was formatted and will explain the difference between the words “shall” and “should.”

Planning Commissioner Mueller inquired whether the document will be housed on the City’s website in a format that allows easy access and view.

Planning Commissioner Lyle noted that no reference was made in the document to the Downtown Design Plan.

Senior Planner Linder indicated that the Downtown Design Plan will be chaptered into the document as well as the Water Conservation Guidelines.

Planning Commissioner Escobar inquired whether the list of standards would result in cost increases on a general basis, incrementally, for the construction of single-family or multi-family dwellings by increasing the standards.

Mayor Pro Tempore Sellers entered and was seated.

Planning Commissioner Weston stated that there would be an approximate 2%-3% increase in costs associated with the revised standards (e.g., installation of splash box systems to the storm drain system would increase costs by \$8,000). He noted that a LEEDS sustainable design were not incorporated into the document and felt that they should be incorporated. He said that he would provide the City’s consultant with a list of LEED design items.

Planning Commissioner Mueller said that the document talks about natural lighting but does not address other energy saving items that the City typically requests in designs. There may be a need to add items to address alternative ways of saving energy.

Debbie Lagomarcino Rudd, RRM Design Group, walked the Council, Board and Commission through the proposed draft amendments to the Architectural Review Handbook. She indicated that she and staff will address a few of the guidelines/standards that they would like to bring to the City Council, ARB and Planning Commission’s attention. She indicated that the document starts off with single family residential. She stated that the document contains a preamble paragraph found on page 1 that addresses each of the main chapters. If the Council wants to see an overriding statement on how to use the document and the purpose of the document in the handbook, this information can be inserted at the beginning of the document. She indicated that by the end of the meeting she would like to have a clear direction on what the group believes should be added, changed and/or incorporated into a refined draft document.

Ms. Rudd indicated that the document will be used by property owners and design professionals, hopefully to make it clear, upfront, the architectural design that the City of Morgan Hill would like to see in the future. The handbook is also to be used by staff when it reviews applications. It is a goal to provide an updated handbook through a user friendly document that incorporates illustrations depicting minimum expectations by the use of text, graphics and photographs. She stated that the document contains four separate chapters: 1) single family residential, 2) multi family residential, 3) commercial and industrial, and 4) gateways.

Mayor Kennedy suggested that the slide presentation being presented this evening be incorporated, somehow, into the document as it identifies the contents of the document.

Ms. Rudd indicated that she has taken the City's standards and guidelines, incorporating them into one document. She stated that the standards are the minimum requirements found in the Design Review Ordinance. She said that the Ordinance contains language that gives the ARB and staff the authority/flexibility to take an "artistic" look at a project that is fitting of the community and approve the design.

Planning Commissioner Weston inquired where in the document it states who would have the final say on the design review approval process.

Senior Planner Linder stated that in most instances, the Council is not involved in the design review process, unless appealed. She indicated that the Council appointed the ARB to apply the Design Review Ordinance. She said that the ARB may find that a design or use of colors are acceptable; indicating that the use of colors is subjective. She clarified that the decisions of the ARB are appealable and that the appeal process is currently in place.

Mayor Pro Tempore Sellers felt that the handbook should allow for creativity or "out of the box" designs, allowing for creativity or a design that is clearly not mainstream that may enhance the beauty of the community.

Ms. Rudd stated that the handbook would allow the ARB to make exceptions to design review standards and encourage flexibility/creativity in designs.

Planning Manager Rowe indicated that the preamble in front of the handbook can stipulate the encouragement of creativity in design(s).

Mayor Kennedy inquired whether there were cities known for good design practices (e.g., Santa Barbara).

Planning Commissioner Weston felt that Pleasanton, San Francisco and Morgan Hill have beautiful designs.

Ms. Rudd indicated that San Luis Obispo, part of Huntington Beach and part of San Juan Capistrano have good design guidelines. These cities have set the bar high in terms of development.

Mayor Kennedy inquired whether the proposed guidelines would raise the bar in terms of design.

Ms. Rudd indicated that the document contains standards as well as guidelines. She stated that the standards are “shall” (mandatory) and the guidelines are “should” (suggestions and not a requirement).

Ms. Rudd walked the Council through the handbook, covering the following:

### **Single Family Residential**

Page 5 - Grading and drainage as it relates to development adjacent to low laying properties.

Ms. Rudd stated that grading and drainage needs to be considered, on site, taking into consideration adjacent development. She indicated that grading and drainage should match or be compatible with neighboring properties.

Board Member Kennett indicated that the ARB suggested that the guidelines include “intent statements” followed by ways to achieve goals.

Ms. Rudd indicated that she has not incorporated all of the comments from the ARB. She stated that she has included the ARB’s recommendation as notations contained in the draft document. She said that objective statements are included at the beginning of each chapter and that it is now being suggested to provide an objective/text statement at the beginning of each sub section.

Planning Commissioner Weston did not know whether the shaded text would be legible if faxed to clients. Ms. Rudd stated that she would look into this concern.

Page 15 - Standards for Garages & Other/Ancillary Structures.

No comments were offered.

Page 17 – Planting Areas & Hardscape Design. Ms. Rudd stated that it is proposed to have trees on either side of arterial roads. As you walk on sidewalks on an arterial street, it is proposed that there be planted parkways on either side of the sidewalks. This prevents fences from being constructed up to the sidewalk and installation of sidewalks up to the street. This design would give you an arterial road with a nice feel to it.

Planning Commissioner Mueller suggested that all streets be designed as identified by Ms. Rudd. He felt that there were a lot of reasons to design detached sidewalks. He recommended that new street standards be implemented in order to incorporate them into the handbook.

---

Page – 20 Walls & Fencing. New standard suggests that fences and sound walls need to be setback from the street.

No comments were offered.

### **Multi Family Residential**

Page 29 – Parking Areas. It is recommended that parking areas be separated from the building by a pedestrian sidewalk and a landscape strip.

No comments were offered.

Page 34 – Entries, Doorways and Windows. It is being suggested that a building would not be allowed to be built without articulation. This section will be a standard.

No comments were offered.

Page 35 – Scale and Massing of buildings. Avoid multi family buildings that are one big box. It is proposed that buildings are to be broken up; providing ideas or ways to break up buildings.

Planning Commissioner Lyle inquired whether the handbook discusses the maximum length of buildings.

Ms. Rudd responded that the handbook does not stipulate a limit to the length of a multi family building.

Planning Commissioner Lyle stated that he was surprised that the handbook does not discourage long buildings. He said that the City has received feedback about the appearance of lengthy buildings.

Senior Planner Linder referred to page 25 that addresses clustering of buildings, breaking up the units into smaller clusters.

Ms. Rudd indicated that the City could indicate a maximum length for single or two story buildings.

Planning Commissioner Acevedo did not see anything wrong with having a long building design as long as the architect/designer does something interesting/creative with the architecture of the building.

Planning Commissioner Lyle stated that an access issue, at a minimum, is associated with the design of a long building.

Ms. Rudd referred to the third bullet found on page 25 that would address Planning Commissioner Lyle's concern.

Mayor Pro Tempore Sellers agreed that the third bullet should be the goal. Regardless of the length of the building, there will be the appearance of a break in the buildings. He felt that an architect would want to break up the building.

### **Commercial & Industrial**

Planning Commissioner Escobar noted that the handbook states that scales in proportion in keeping with the architectural style of the building. He inquired as to the definition of “keeping within” as opposed to the verbiage of being “complementary” or “consistent with” as these terms are applied throughout the document.

Page 60 – Parking areas. It is proposed that parking lots on corner sites not be located at the intersection. The building should be placed close to and oriented toward the street. This is a guideline/suggestion and not a standard.

Planning Commissioners Lyle and Mueller felt that this section should be a standard due to safety and circulation issues.

Mayor Kennedy did not know if moving a building up to the street is the answer as he did not see the sample building being displayed on a corner lot (Walgreen) as an attractive design.

Mayor Pro Tempore Sellers noted the designs of the two examples cited were ones that met the specific needs of the tenant. He stated that the Rite Aid design was precipitated by the drive through. He felt that the Walgreen design will look attractive in 20 years when the landscape matures. He said that windows were desired to break up the mass of the building but that he did not know if the windows were appropriate.

Ms. Rudd inquired whether the City wants to encourage buildings to be pushed up to the corner. If so, should it be a requirement or a suggestion. She noted that this is a suggestion in the handbook. She stated that she likes buildings at the street corner as it frames the street better. She recommended raising the bar for buildings on corner lots if the City does not like the architecture as corner lots are highly visible to the community.

Planning Commissioner Escobar inquired whether a building that is designed on one corner prescribes how the other three corners would be designed/developed. He inquired whether it is being recommended that buildings be designed up against the street, competing with each other or whether there was some ability to add to the aesthetics and appeal of the buildings by having additional setbacks or setting them further away from the corner.

Ms. Rudd did not believe that a building designed on a corner would prescribe development on the other corner lots. She felt that scale and massing would be important and that the design of the building would be secondary. She indicated that the corner design standards are for intersections within the City and do not address Gateway areas.

Council Member Chang did not support all four corners having buildings sited at the corner as it would appear massive, overwhelming and would give an overcrowded appearance. She stated that she would support 2 of the 4 intersections having buildings designed toward the street.

Planning Commissioner Weston felt that a 30 foot setback affords the opportunity to landscape the front of the buildings.

Ms. Rudd clarified that a 30 foot setback would be required.

Planning Commissioner Escobar inquired whether the same or different standards would be required for commercial and industrial lots. If different, he recommended a separate chapter for commercial and industrial development. He felt that unless the City is clear as to what is required for commercial and industrial zoning districts, the standards will be lost.

Mayor Kennedy concurred that the handbook should have separate chapters for commercial and industrial zoning districts. He said that it was his belief that there is a consensus that buildings can be built on corner lots, if designed attractively.

Planning Commissioner Mueller noted that the handbook indicates that it is preferred that a building be sited at a corner/intersection unless there are specific reasons why they cannot be sited on the corner with the appropriate design and landscaping.

Mayor Pro Tempore Sellers felt that latitude should be given to the development of buildings on corner lots.

Council Member Carr felt that if the design is left flexible, the user of the building will want individuals to see that parking is available in the front of the building.

Ms. Rudd felt that it appears that it was the consensus that this section is preferred as a “should” and not a “shall.” She indicated that it would be an effort and would add to the cost of the handbook to separate the chapters between commercial and industrial designs. She estimated that it would cost \$3,000-\$5,000 to separate the commercial and industrial standards.

Mayor Pro Tempore Sellers inquired whether the handbook can distinguish the differences between the commercial and industrial standards versus having a different chapter for each.

Planning Commissioner Acevedo noted that there is far more vacant industrial land as opposed to commercial land available to be built upon. He felt that the City would be running out of commercial lands before you run out of industrially zoned land.

Planning Commissioner Weston noted that most of the standards/guidelines apply to industrial designs versus commercial designs.

Council Member Tate recommended that an introductory discussion be incorporated into each chapter.

Mayor Kennedy recommended that additional description/text be incorporated into the handbook to address the issues raised.

Planning Commissioner Escobar recommended that in the introductory discussion, it be stated that there will be some distinction in this chapter between commercial and industrial. Also, that a table of contents be added that states that certain standards apply only to industrial design or commercial designs if there is not to be a separate chapter for commercial and industrial development.

Page 63 – Design theme. Should this section be a standard or a “should?” It is stated that the use of corporate chain architecture is not allowed and that corporate tenants shall design buildings to keep the scale, character and the feel of the community.

Council Member Carr said that if a Trader Joes wants to come into town and the City likes their corporate architecture, there should be some flexibility to approve a corporate design.

Planning Commissioner Escobar recommended that the statement be retained that reads “the use of a corporate chain architecture is not allowed” and add the following: “unless compatible or consistent with ....”

Mayor Pro Tempore Sellers noted that the In and Out Burgers’ representative came up with a great design and that he would hate to preclude a great franchise design. He recommended that the text be more descriptive.

Planning Commissioner Mueller agreed that there may be a corporate design that is not a traditional design that may be acceptable to the City.

Planning Commissioner Weston inquired whether it could be stipulated that the project architect shall attempt to make a stylistic representative design versus an authentic representation in the design of a building.

Ms. Rudd indicated that the statement was incorporated in the handbook to avoid the southern California standard architecture. She said that it is the intent to give the ARB enough information and discretion to inform the architect as to the type of design the City would like to see in the community.

Mayor Kennedy felt that the statement raises the bar and that it gives the ARB the discretion to lower the bar.

Ms. Rudd recommended that the statement be modified to state “with the desired scale of the community.”



---

Page 64 – Roof forms. This is a guideline to avoid commercial and/or industrial buildings from having a long facade as a standard.

No comments were offered.

Page 70 – Articulation. Building designs shall incorporate 360 degree architecture. When you have a large building with a blank wall, something needs to be done with the blank wall to articulate and change the mass of the building.

Planning Commissioner Escobar said that in reviewing the photographs, it is easy to distinguish which are retail and/or commercial buildings. However, he could not find that this was the case with industrial buildings. He recommended that better photographic examples be used for industrial buildings or identify that the designs are for professional or industrial buildings (indicate the type of building in captions).

### **Gateway Areas**

Page 85 – Gateways. Defines what is considered to be a gateway.

Council Member Carr indicated that it was his belief that the General Plan stipulates that train depots are gateway areas and should therefore be spelled out as a gateway.

Page 87 – Gateway lot layouts. 30 foot landscape buffers shall be installed in gateway intersections, between the street and buildings. Parking lots and drive aisles are not to be sited within the 30 foot landscape buffer. Gas stations on corner lots in gateway areas cannot be sited in the front of buildings. In other city streets, gas stations on corner lots would be acceptable.

Planning Commissioner Mueller noted that a gas station would be visible from the freeway.

Ms. Rudd stated that pole signs would not be permitted in gateway intersections.

Planning Commissioner Weston stated that a gas station is being built at the corner of Tennant Avenue and Monterey Road and that the developer was required to install a nice landscape buffer. He inquired whether there was a way to eliminate the “for lease” signs posted and substitute landscaping (e.g., oak tree).

Ms. Rudd indicated that the sign ordinance would regulate location of signage. She noted that the gateway section contains a signage section.

Senior Planner Linder indicated that a specimen sized tree was required to be installed as part of the gas station approval.

Mayor Kennedy requested that staff investigate the City’s sign ordinance to see if it regulates “for lease” signs.

Page 89 – Building Design for gateway areas. The City is raising the bar by stating that no drive throughs will be allowed in entry gateway areas.

Planning Commissioner Escobar felt that it was being stated that the City does not want a drive through to be visible from the road and that it needs to be screened.

Council Member Carr was not sure whether the City wants to prohibit drive throughs. He noted that the new Jumping Java Juice has opened on Monterey Road and that adoption of this standard would not allow this use in a gateway.

Ms. Rudd noted that this section of Monterey Road is not a gateway area.

Mayor Kennedy noted that a drive through would not be allowed with the In and Out Burgers' design based on this section as the use would be located on a corner (freeway and Cochrane Road).

Planning Manager Rowe stated that he would not consider the location of the In and Out Burgers as a corner lot but a quadrant of an intersection.

Ms. Rudd said that what is being discouraged is a long stacking distance and the elimination of as much paving from intersections as possible.

Mayor Kennedy did not believe that this section would apply to freeway interchanges.

Planning Commissioner Weston felt that the City would want to see a lot of trees and good architecture in gateway areas.

Planning Commissioner Lyle inquired whether a grandfather clause could be applied to the In and Out Burgers' design.

Mayor Kennedy felt that the In and Out Burgers' drive through is a special case that needs to be addressed.

Council Member Carr recommended a better definition of a corner and a gateway be incorporated into the handbook.

Staff indicated that exterior remodels would require that the new standards be applied.

Planning Commissioner Escobar felt that the concern is that of the architectural aesthetics coming into the City. If drive throughs can be architecturally treated, a business that complies with this should be allowed to present their design. If the City is ruling out drive throughs because the underlying sense is that every drive through would create a mass of cars, he does not necessarily buy this. He felt that if a building can

mitigate the aesthetics of a drive through, a business should not be precluded from designing a drive through.

Mayor Pro Tempore Sellers said that if a row of trees are planted or other design alternatives applied, it could mitigate the concern of the drive through.

Planning Commissioner Mueller indicated that if all you are able to see is trees and landscaping on a corner, you would not know that a business exists.

Planning Commissioner Weston indicated that the size of a building dictates parking needs.

Ms. Rudd clarified that the City would only be stating that drive throughs would not be allowed in intersections.

Mayor Kennedy noted that it has already been suggested that the document defines a corner and a gateway.

Ms. Rudd did not believe that the City needs to address items that currently exist as it is addressed at the beginning of the section where remodels are addressed.

Senior Planner Linder requested that the Council, Board and Planning Commission raise any items that they believe warrant discussion and/or direction.

Planning Commissioner Lyle referred to page 3, where it states that a minimum of every third house shall be set back a minimum of five feet. He noted that under the Measure C criteria, it states that alternating homes shall have a minimum of a five foot setback. He felt that this was a more rigid interpretation. He felt that the five foot setback should be more than every third home. He indicated that there is a four foot deviation under the Measure C criteria for multi family housing. He recommended that the handbook be tightened to be consistent with Measure C versus using a less stringent direction. He referred to page 5, noting that there is no mention of the retention ponds. However, retention ponds are mentioned in the multi family chapter. He indicated that retention ponds are acceptable under many circumstances. He felt that the section as listed under page 5 needs to include retention pond bullets as both single family and multi family residential sections need to mention something about retention facilities.

Planning Commissioner Escobar referred to page 33, the roof forms and the guidelines. He noted that the third bullet addresses multiple formed roofs and recommended that reference be made to state “such as gables.” He also referred to page 37, materials and colors. He noted that it is being stated that material changes shall occur at “other logical locations.” He recommended that this verbiage be replaced with “or appropriate location.”

Planning Commissioner Acevedo referred to page 51 where it talks about the standards and guidelines. He felt that the number one reason for this section is to ensure public safety. He agreed that the other reasons as stated were important, but recommended that public safety be listed at the top, noting that it is

not even mentioned. He indicated that this is not only for access and egress but for public safety. He felt that if you incorporate too many of the guidelines in the wrong way, it would create a temptation for criminal activity in some places. He referred to page 60, and recommended an added bullet to read: "These features should not be incorporated to camouflage the parking areas but to enhance the aesthetics of them." He felt that it needs to be recognized that retailers require that their businesses be seen through the perception of the fullness of the parking areas. He felt that businesses use this from a business attraction marketing standpoint. Also, it is important for police officers driving by to see and monitor a parking situation in certain hours of the day.

Ms. Rudd felt that this is a philosophical question to be taken up. She indicated that she is suggesting that parking areas be screened from the public view as much as possible by using berm walls. Using berms low enough will allow you to see over them and allow safety visibility.

Mayor Kennedy felt that berms provide a natural form of screening. He does not believe that the use of berms jeopardizes security.

Planning Commissioner Weston noted that the City has a mechanism in place where police and fire have a means to review design/site plans through the development review process.

Planning Commissioner Acevedo did not believe that the police or fire departments mandate design but give city officials a heads up that there could be a problem with safety and security.

Council Member Carr noted that the City is trying to cut back in the irrigation of turf areas which may result in a problem if the installation of berming is required.

Ms. Rudd noted that page 59 states that screening shall be a minimum of three feet in height.

Planning Commissioner Lyle recommended that language be incorporated such that berming does not become too high.

Council Member Carr referred to the lighting standard, indicating that it appears that the standard is too high. He felt that light bulbs at a human scale would light sidewalks versus trees. He inquired whether the 12-15 feet height was an appropriate lighting standard. He recommended that the lighting standard be lowered to be underneath the tree canopy.

Mayor Pro Tempore Sellers referred to page 35 - scale and massing in family residential. He indicated that there will be areas in the City that will have buildings greater than two stores. He recommended that the standards apply to buildings of two or more stories.

Planning Commissioner Mueller indicated that some of the new trash enclosures are sited in visible areas. He recommended that the guidelines be strengthened to ensure that trash enclosures are screened.

Board Member Martin addressed the standard that requires that structural retaining walls, part of the building, shall match the exterior building. He noted that there are times that rocks are used to construct retaining walls. He indicated that there are two types of retaining walls: landscape retaining walls and structural retaining walls such as those used in hillside areas. He recommended that the bullet be amended to read that “Retaining walls greater than 18 inches in height, which are part of the structural part of the buildings, shall be textured to complement the main structure.”

In response to Council Member Carr’s question, Senior Planner Linder indicated that developers have not yet been given the opportunity to review and comment on the draft handbook. The next step in the review process would be to circulate the document and receive public input as part of the public hearing process.

Council Member Carr expressed concern that the changes to the handbook would incrementally increase costs to housing, specifically affordable housing. He understands that the City has a desire to alter the design standards. However, if the City is interested in providing affordable housing, you cannot tie the hands of nonprofit housing developers. He indicated that he has heard from non profit organizations about their concerns on the impacts of Measure C to the cost of housing. He noted that the City is now creating guidelines that are “shalls.” This could eliminate affordable housing in Morgan Hill. He did not believe that the City has heard enough about the concerns relating to Measure C before being approved by the voters. He stated that he would like to hear comments about the proposed standards prior to adopting any changes.

Mayor Kennedy stated that he would support a redevelopment agency subsidy in order to keep the development standards high rather than lowering the standards.

Planning Commissioner Escobar expressed concern that the City may be incrementally pricing individuals out of the housing market in Morgan Hill. He clarified that he was not suggesting that the City lower the standards. However, if the standards are adopted without assessing the incremental costs, and adopting the standards in a vacuum, the City may be eliminating a strata of individuals from being able to live in Morgan Hill who do not qualify for affordable housing.

Council Member Carr recommended that the City reach out to some of the non profit organizations to receive their thoughts on the proposed standards.

Ms. Rudd referred to page 11, indicating that this page specifically addresses this issue. She felt that the language affords flexibility in the articulation of all sides of the building. It may be acceptable to keep the articulation of the buildings simple as long as the visible sides of the buildings from the streets are articulated. This section provides guidelines to developers as to how far the articulation needs to be taken to on a building(s).

Mayor Pro Tempore Sellers recommended that this statement also be made in the multi family residential section of the handbook.

---

Ms. Rudd confirmed the following: 1) include intent statements after every subheading/subsection; 2) include an introduction at the beginning of the entire document that talks about who will be using the document, the goal of the document, and how to use the document; 3) encourage creativity; and 4) introduce the LEED elements (environmental elements).

Mayor Kennedy felt that it would be helpful to include examples of LEED designs. He recommended that a reference to LEED be included or that a chapter on LEED elements be incorporated into the handbook.

Ms. Judd indicated that she would not be separating the commercial and industrial standards into chapters. She will include an introduction at the beginning of the chapter describing the chapter, incorporating the items discussed this evening. She would double check the gateway locations with the General Plan to make sure that they are the same. Also, to define a gateway and corners.

**Action:**        *By consensus, the above comments were offered. No formal action taken.*

#### **FUTURE COUNCIL-INITIATED AGENDA ITEMS**

No items were identified.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, Mayor Kennedy adjourned the meeting at 9:27 p.m.

#### **MINUTES RECORDED AND PREPARED BY:**

---

**IRMA TORREZ, CITY CLERK**